

PATENT APPLN. NO. 10/580,846  
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111

- PATENT  
NON-FINAL

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please replace Fig. 11 with the attached replacement drawing sheet.

Attachment: 1 Replacement Drawing Sheet (Fig. 11)

FEB 12 2008  
PATENT  
NON-FINAL

PATENT APPLN. NO. 10/580,846  
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiMarco (U.S. Patent No. 7,147,573) in view of Official Notice. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)<sup>1</sup> as being anticipated by [sic, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over(?)] Evans (U.S. Patent No. 7,166,041) in view of Official Notice.

The position of the Office is that each of DiMarco and Evans disclose a club head meeting the limitations of claims 1 and 2 of the present application. The Office takes Official Notice that it is well known in the art to attach a shaft having a grip to a club head.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the head of the golf putter is provided with "an outer guide comprising a bar projected from a back thereof in a ring shape or U shape substantially parallel to the horizontal plane and an inner guide comprising a retention body projected in the same horizontal plane as the outer guide, said head being further provided with a weight having a fixation means, which is movably retained along an arcuate path

---

<sup>1</sup> The publication date of Evans, January 23, 2007, is subsequent to the earliest effective filing date of the present application, the May 26, 2006, filing date of PCT/JP2006/306025. Thus, Evans is an effective reference only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on its January 28, 2005, application filing date.

formed between the outer guide and the inner guide." Claim 2 has been canceled. Claim 3 has been amended to recite a dependency only on claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that DiMarco and Evans fail to disclose a golf club head meeting the limitations of amended claim 1. Each of the golf club heads 20 disclosed in Dimarco and Evans is a wood type club, and the weight member 50 can be moved or fixed within recess 40 formed in the club head 20. Also, the structure identified by the Office as "a guide that has a bar projecting from the back in a U-shape" in Dimarco and Evans corresponds to a side face or back face of the hollow club head 20.

In contrast to the above, claim 1 of the present application is directed to a putter-type golf club head, and an arrangement is made such that the weight 11 can be moved or fixed in an arcuate (or U-shaped) path formed between the guide 9 and the retention body 10, each projecting outwardly of the head 1. Thus, the golf club head recited in amended claim 1 and those disclosed in Dimarco and Evans are distinguished from each other with respect to both the type of golf club heads and the path (or route) in which the weight (or weight member) is moved or fixed.

When a wood-type golf club and a putter-type golf club are compared, it is the putter-type golf club which golf players make

much of the "feel". In greater detail, for or with putter-type club heads, it is desirable that the weight, the weight balance and the moment of inertia of the club head are adjustable respectively within a wide range.

When compared with the golf club heads according to Dimarco and Evans, the golf club head of amended claim 1 can provide a broader range for the movement of the weight and a larger weight ratio of the weight relative to the head. Consequently, according to the present invention, it is possible to provide a putter-type golf club which may satisfy a relatively large number of golfers. This advantageous result can never be brought about if the golf club head disclosed in Dimarco and Evans is applied to a putter-type golf club head.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans in view of Official Notice and Oda (JP 06-238022). The propriety of this rejection depends on the rejections of claim 1, on which claim 3 depends. Since the rejections of claim 1 have been overcome, claim 3 is patentable.

Removal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of the claims is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Fig. 11 has been amended to be identified as "Prior Art" since only that which is old is shown in the drawing.

PATENT APPLN. NO. 10/580,846  
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111

PATENT  
NON-FINAL

The foregoing is believed to be a complete and proper response to the Office Action dated October 12, 2007, and is believed to place this application in condition for allowance. If, however, minor issues remain that can be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for any such extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 111833.

In the event any additional fees are required, please also charge our Deposit Account No. 111833.

Respectfully submitted,

KUBOVCIK & KUBOVCIK



Ronald J. Kubovcik  
Reg. No. 25,401

Atty. Case No. OCA-016  
The Farragut Building  
Suite 710  
900 17th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 887-9023  
Fax: (202) 887-9093  
RJK/JBF